

The BLM appreciates the comments provided by Teton County representatives regarding the South Park Recreation Project Plan 100% draft (RPP). The BLM has reproduced each comment below and has provided a response.

Site Design

The visitor center comes across as a strong component of the park design. This brings up many questions regarding scope of services, agency responsibility, staffing and maintenance of such a facility. Substantive conversations will need to occur amongst local agencies regarding this proposed amenity and construction is likely to occur in the distant future.

• Response: The BLM agrees with this statement.

The plan calls for two restroom facilities on the project site, one on the east and one on the west side of the highway. Based upon the scale of the project and the number of anticipated users, we would recommend a high service standard for the proposed restroom facilities. Potable water and waste disposal are critical in providing clean and enjoyable facilities.

♦ Response: According to the RPP, the restroom facilities will be double-stall vault-toilets. Potable water will be made available on-site, but not inside the restrooms themselves unless a different and more expensive model of vault toilet is used. For the intended use of the site, two single-stall vault toilets will be adequate to meet the anticipated needs of users. The provision of potable water near the restrooms will elevate the comfort level of the site. The BLM would prefer the facility remain a pack-in pack-out site and does not anticipate providing waste/trash removal services to this site. In the future, if management of the site is turned over to an entity other than the BLM, such as Teton County, trash removal service may be provided at the discretion of that entity, not by the BLM.

The west parking lot should be moved to the south to lessen the required length of the driveway access and provide a larger usable park area north of the visitor center.

♦ Response: The site plan provided in the RPP is conceptual in nature and is not intended to be final. Detailed adjustments to the site plan, like the one suggested above, will be made during the design development and construction document phases of the project. However, it should be noted that the site plan should maintain a significant physical and aesthetic buffer between the recreation site and the Evans Construction concrete plant to the south.

Multiple covered shelters should be provided for picnic use. The size of the shelter should vary from individual tables to shelters that would accommodate large groups.

• Response: As previously noted, the site plan provided in the RPP is conceptual in nature and is not intended to be final. Detailed adjustments to the site plan, like the one

suggested above, will be made during the design development and construction document phases of the project.

Potable water will be required to construct an irrigation system to manage and maintain trees and turf. Turf should be added to the west portion of the park to provide a more diverse and user-friendly park experience.

- Response: The BLM does not consider the development of an irrigation system to be contingent on the availability of potable water. Irrigation water could be non-potable if providing potable water for this use proves too expensive or complicated. It should be noted that the BLM intends on developing potable water for use by recreationists. This potable water may or may not be available for irrigation.
- ♦ The intent of the site plan is to allow the open areas of the site to remain much as they are now in that the open grassy areas on the plan would be drought tolerant and/or native species. Some of these areas could be mowed to provide for more diverse uses. It was never the intention of the BLM to provide large areas of irrigated turf-grass or a manicured park environment. The BLM will consider developing an area of irrigated turf grass in the immediate vicinity of the visitor center in order to provide users a more manicured experience in that area. However, in the future, if management of the site is turned over to an entity other than the BLM, such as Teton County, a larger area of irrigated and manicured turf could be added at the discretion of that entity, not by the BLM.

The majority of trails should be paved for ADA accommodation and lower maintenance cost.

• Response: All trails will be designed and constructed to meet ADA requirements.

A maintenance building should be included on site to house a minimum of one ATV, mower and miscellaneous repair and maintenance supplies.

Response: The storage requirement can be accommodated by purchasing a vault-toilet building that incorporates an attached storage room. This has been noted in the text of the RPP. This change does not affect the site plan.

At least one dumpster per side of highway should be provided. The dumpster should be located adjacent to the main access roads.

♦ As stated above, the BLM would prefer the facility remain a pack-in pack-out site and does not anticipate providing waste/trash removal services to this site. In the future, if management of the site is turned over to an entity other than the BLM, such as Teton County, trash removal service may be provided at the discretion of that entity, not by the BLM.

Overall, the site on the west side of the highway should accommodate a greater amount of usable greenspace. This would reduce the amount of natural vegetation and mass groupings of trees. The larger amount of greenspace will accommodate a greater variety of uses.

♦ Response: The RPP intended this facility to be situated in a naturalistic, river riparian setting. The overall visitor experience is intended to be in context with the region and the Snake River. A lot of the massed tree plantings are intended to help screen undesirable views and create an experience that is somewhat shielded from the presence of the highway. However, the site plan provided in the RPP is conceptual in nature and is not intended to be final. In the future, if management of this site is turned over to an entity other than the BLM, adjustments may be made, by that entity in conjunction with the BLM, to the overall design and intended recreational uses of the site.

Use of the access road on the west side of the highway may be impacted in May and June when there is a "flood fight" and in September and October when dike maintenance is typically preformed.

Response: The BLM does not anticipate conflicts with recreational users when floods threaten as river floaters and other recreationists will most likely not be on or near the river during this time. The BLM is also confident that logistical accommodations can be made to provide access to dike maintenance vehicles without disrupting use of the site.

Development Schedule/Standards

Development should take place in concert with the resolution of the highway ingress/egress design issues and coordinated with WDOT's highway reconstruction project as applicable.

• Response: The BLM agrees with this statement.

The first phase of construction should include all site utilities to the extent possible. These utilities would include, but are not limited to: power, water, sewer, and telephone.

Response: The first phase of the development has been amended to include the provision of utilities. It should be noted that municipal sewer and water is not available at this site. It is anticipated that a well will supply potable water and vault toilets will replace the need for sewer. Telephone and electrical service will be provided.

An automated irrigation system should be included in the development for all tree plantings and turf areas.

Response: Cost for an irrigation system is included in the RPP budget.

Due to the size and scope of user traffic, asphalt surfaces should be considered on all parking and driveway surfaces at initial development to manage parking and reduce maintenance.

• Response: The BLM agrees with this statement and the RPP phasing has been amended to reflect this change.

Development Costs

Development costs should reflect all additional needs and requirements discussed above.

• Response: The RPP phasing and cost estimate has been updated to reflect these additions.

Phase one development costs includes two restrooms. However, only one restroom is priced. Additionally, we estimate the cost of a restroom to be closer to \$100,000 each.

• Response: The restroom quantity on the cost estimate has been corrected. The cost for vault toilets was provided by the manufacturer as an installed price.

We recommend increasing the cost of signage by two times

• Response: The cost for signs has been amended to reflect this recommendation.

Water service or well and irrigation should be included in cost estimate. In addition, grading, topsoil and turf cost for a manicured park surface should be included.

• Response: Cost of water source development has been included in the cost estimate. Cost for grading, topsoil, and turf cost for a manicured park surface was not included in the cost estimate because these features were not envisioned on the conceptual site plan (see previous comments on this subject, above).

A revised cost for the visitor's center should reflect a \$250 per square foot cost.

Response: The cost estimate has been amended accordingly.

Operating Costs

We found several items missing from the operating cost estimate. The site should be developed in a more manicured and manageable level, therefore requiring increased operational expenses. Moving and turf maintenance will be required approximately twice a week. Also, irrigation service and operations will need to be completed. Staff time will be required to maintain the landscaping, site amenities, trash pick-up and customer service. Finally, cleaning service will have to be contracted to clean the visitor's center and restrooms at least twice a day for a minimum of 30 weeks. Following is a cost estimate for these described services:

2 seasonal staff \$24,640 Visitor' Center Cleaning Contract \$5,000 Restroom Cleaning Contract \$17,000

Dumpster rental	\$1,000
Turf Management	\$6,280
Irrigation Management	\$3,500
Parking Lot Repairs and Striping	\$2,500
Visitor's Center Staffing	\$50,000

Sub Total: \$110,320 Project Plan Estimate: \$41,712

Total O&M: \$152,032

♦ Response: The O&M estimate has been modified to reflect a projected annual O&M expenditure of 2% of construction costs, a significant increase over the estimate included in the 100% draft. However, the RPP intended this facility to be situated in a naturalistic, river riparian setting. The overall visitor experience is intended to be in context with the region and the Snake River. Consequently, the site plan, as depicted, would not require the noted additional costs pertaining to turf management. The restrooms would be cleaned in accordance with current BLM practice (again, these are vault toilets, not plumbed restrooms), which would not require the restroom cleaning contract noted above. The BLM will not be providing trash service, eliminating the need for a dumpster rental.

It should be noted that the site plan provided in the RPP is conceptual in nature and is not intended to be final. In the future, if management of this site is turned over to an entity other than the BLM, adjustments may be made, by that entity in conjunction with the BLM, to the overall design and intended recreational uses of the site. The BLM concedes that management of the facility by an entity other than the BLM may indeed incur the costs listed above by Teton county.